



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

APRIL, 1902

ISRAEL AND TOTEMISM¹.

THE whole question of Semitic totemism is inseparably associated with the name of the late Professor W. Robertson Smith, whose brilliant studies upon the early religion of the Semites inaugurated a new method by the systematic introduction of anthropological evidence. It is now more than thirty years since Mr. J. F. McLennan laid it down as a working hypothesis that the ancient nations of the world had passed through a peculiar kind of fetichism or animism which finds its typical representation in the totem-tribes of Australia and America. Ten years later, Professor Robertson Smith contributed an epoch-making paper to the *Journal of Philology* on "Animal Worship and Animal Tribes among the Ancient Arabs, and in the Old Testament," in the course of which he put forth in a tentative way certain points of evidence which, in his opinion, were "remarkably confirmatory of McLennan's theory." Next, the systems of social organization which were taken to belong to totemism received his closer attention, and in 1885 he produced an elaborate investigation of the

¹ The present writer desires to acknowledge his indebtedness to Dr. J. G. Frazer, who read this article in proof and favoured him with valuable observations, especially on the present position of totemism, which he has been permitted to quote.

principles underlying kinship and marriage in early Arabia¹. In this work Robertson Smith formally laid down the theory that the Arabs passed through the totem stage, and that "they entered it before they were differentiated from their brethren who, in historical times, lived outside the peninsula." All the Semites, therefore, had passed through the totem stage, but since the Northern Semites "advanced in social and political life so much more rapidly than Arabia . . . we cannot look for more than very fragmentary relics of the primitive system." A considerable advance was made in 1886 when, in the article "Sacrifice" in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, the theory was proposed that sacrifice was a ceremonial meal of a totem-clan, and this was fully worked out in the *Religion of the Semites*, where a whole mass of evidence was collected and brought to bear upon the ritual of Semitic sacrifice and its original meaning.

Our knowledge of totemism and totem-tribes, however, has been greatly enlarged since McLennan's time, and recent studies have made it very evident that the utmost caution must be observed before we can safely derive survivals of animism or of exogamy from an earlier stage of totemism. Reserving further observations for the present, we need only mention that the members of a clan do not always consider themselves to be descended from the totem whose name they bear, that exogamy can and does exist without totemism, and that forbidden foods are not always associated with totemic animals and plants. The origin and meaning of totemism are not yet quite clear, and in spite of the relatively large amount of evidence it still remains a matter of some doubt whether even the Aryans had totemism.

To what extent the lamented Robertson Smith would have recast his views had he lived, it is of course impossible to say. Certain it is that he was ever prepared to accept

¹ A new edition of *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia* will shortly be published by Messrs. A. & C. Black.

fresh evidence, to weigh all arguments and criticisms, to reconsider and reject any statement of his which might appear unfounded. Meanwhile, Professor Zapletal has opened up afresh the question of totemism and the religion of Israel¹, and, by making a thorough onslaught upon Robertson Smith's arguments, has endeavoured to demolish the structure which that scholar had so carefully raised. Zapletal's victory is apparently so easy, and his refutations are superficially so overwhelming, that, although it may be admitted that he has done good service in pointing out some of the weak spots in Robertson Smith's armour, it is to be feared unwary readers will too hastily conclude that the theory of Semitic totemism is to be cast upon one side for the future, and that evidences of animism among the Israelites are almost wholly wanting.

In an introductory chapter Professor Zapletal has briefly outlined the views of later writers on the subject of totemism. He does not fail to recognize that totemism has entered upon a new stage, but, instead of examining the theory of Semitic totemism in the light of recent discoveries—as subsequent writers necessarily must—he has preferred to base his criticisms upon the arguments of the founder.

Professor Zapletal has with great skill and ability collected, on the one side, the arguments of Robertson Smith and his school in favour of Semitic totemism. On the other side, he has with equal care brought together the criticisms of Nöldeke, Wellhausen, Mr. Joseph Jacobs, and others, who have directly handled Robertson Smith's theory. To every argument he has a reply, for every "survival" an explanation.

The evidence in favour of Semitic totemism has been grouped under seven heads—animal names, nature-worship, unclean animals (and forbidden foods), sacrifice,

¹ *Der Totemismus und die Religion Israels. Ein Beitrag zur Religionswissenschaft und zur Erklärung des Alten Testaments* (Freiburg, Switzerland; 1901). pp. x + 176.

tattooing, the *jinn*, and matriarchy. Little attention is paid to *piacula*, and the question of blood-feud is scarcely mentioned. Without examining Professor Zapletal's criticisms in detail, I propose here to touch briefly upon some of his conclusions as he traverses Robertson Smith's evidence under the above heads. In the great majority of cases it is a question of points of evidence which Robertson Smith explained on the theory that they were survivals of totemism, the only legitimate alternative being whether they admit of any other explanation in harmony with the ideas of the time to which they belong. Without passing any judgment upon the totem-theory as a whole, it must be confessed that in the main Zapletal's explanations are inadequate. As the introducer of a new hypothesis Robertson Smith may have pushed the evidence too far, but we seriously doubt whether Zapletal has not endeavoured to disprove too much.

Zapletal very rightly urges that in the case of stone-worship the stone is not in itself a god, but simply an abode of the god (p. 56), in harmony with Robertson Smith¹; he rightly denies—also in company with Robertson Smith²—that names compounded with *šūr* (rock) have anything to do with fetichism. His refutation of the hazardous suggestion that David belonged to a totemic serpent-clan (pp. 68 sq.) is by no means uncalled for. There are serious text-critical difficulties in the way, and it is significant that Robertson Smith nowhere seems to have countenanced his early suggestion³.

That the evidence from animal-names alone is a precarious support for the totem-theory is now clearly recognized⁴, and perhaps the

¹ We miss a reference to *Religion of the Semites*, 2nd ed., pp. 207-212 [here cited as *RS.*]. Cp. G. F. Moore, *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, art. "Idolatry," § 4, col. 2154.

² We miss a reference to *RS.*, p. 210.

³ *Journ. of Phil.*, IX, pp. 99 sq. Zapletal adopts the explanation suggested by Mr. Joseph Jacobs (*Archaeological Review*, May, 1889; see *Studies in Biblical Archaeology*, p. 82; London, 1894). But the friendship between David and Nahash would hardly survive the Ammonite war (2 Sam. ix), and a different theory, which takes this into account, has been proposed by the present writer in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, April, 1900, p. 164.

⁴ Cp. e. g. Jacobs, *op. cit.*, pp. 64-103, especially pp. 68-74, and

safest conclusion at which we can arrive is that the totem-theory *explains* the animal-names, and holds good in default of any better explanation. Now Zapletal notes (pp. 29 sq.), with Nöldeke¹, that the meanings of the animal-names are sometimes uncertain; sometimes they are names of individuals and not clans, and the clan-names may have arisen from individuals with animal-names which are not of totemic origin but may be described as "characteristic." Some of the names, too, are place-names, and may have arisen from the fact that the animal in question frequented the spot². A few of the animals were introduced at a later age³. He observes, with Mr. Jacobs, that the preponderating proportion of animal-names is considerably less than is found in England or Western Europe at the present day, and urges, therefore, that the argument from such names has little weight⁴. Finally, Zapletal argues that the famous "Jaazaniah ben Shaphan" (Ezek. viii. 11), whether the "coney" be a real or a fictitious designation, is devoid of totemic associations. If Shaphan is a real name, he points to Shaphan the courtier of king Josiah (2 Kings xxii. 3) "who was certainly no totem-worshipper." If an invented name, it was chosen as a piece of irony; Jaazaniah, in spite of his name ("Yah hears") was an animal-worshipper, and is called a "ben Shaphan," i.e. "son (follower, worshipper) of a coney"⁵.

Now all this seems to be rather artificial. To take the case of "ben Shaphan," surely it is one thing to say that the giving of animal-names arose in a totemistic stage, it is quite different to argue that all animal-names of whatever age are evidences of an existing totemism. This is not the doctrine of "survivals." It is at least interesting to find the other animal-names Huldah (mole) and Achbor (mouse) among the court of Josiah (2 Kings xxii), and surely Achbor (mouse) ben Micaiah (son of "Who is like Yah") is not ironical! The bearers of animal-names are not necessarily totemists, although, until a stronger case can be made out for the G. Buchanan Gray, *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names* (London, 1896), pp. 86-115, especially pp. 101 sqq.

¹ *Zeit. d. Morgenländ. Gesell.*, XL (1886), pp. 157 sqq.

² Mayer Lambert, *Rev. de l'Hist. des Religions*, XXXVI, 420 (1897), suggests that such geographical names may be derived from the shape of a rock in the neighbourhood, and conjectures that the localities 'Raven's Rock' and 'Wolf's Vat' (Judges vii. 25) may have given birth to aetiological legends of the princes of Midian.

³ The horse is especially mentioned (p. 29); but cp. Robertson Smith's remarks, *Kinship*, pp. 208 sq.; *RS.*, p. 469.

⁴ On English animal-names cp. Lang, *Custom and Myth* (1898), pp. 265 sq.

⁵ Jacobs, *op. cit.*, p. 85, cp. Zapletal, p. 73.

"natural poetry" theory of their origin¹, it remains extremely probable that such names take their rise in animal-worshipping communities.

In another chapter Zapletal discusses nature-worship, and concludes that living animals were not worshipped by Israel, and that the existence of animal-images admits of a better explanation than that suggested by the totem-theory. He allows that star-worship prevailed in Israel during the wanderings in the wilderness (Amos v. 25 sq.), but ascribes it partly to foreign influence and partly to an innate love of nature. In support of this aesthetic admiration for the beauty of the heavens he cites Job xxxi. 27 sq., where, in fact, the kissing of the hand corresponds to the kissing of a sacred image (1 Kings xix. 18, Hos. xiii. 2). Organized and specific astral cults are no doubt foreign to the original religion of Israel, but star-worship itself was only natural among nomad and pastoral tribes, particularly as certain stars were supposed to bring rain². The *maṣṣēbōth*, &c., are explained as external signs of veneration (pp. 56 sq.), as symbols of the presence of the deity. Well-worship, he apparently considers, was borrowed from the Canaanites, to whom the chosen people adapted themselves in many external particulars (pp. 59 sq.). In regard to tree-worship he justly points out that in many cases the sacred trees are pre-Israelite, but observes that we have no sure evidence that the chosen people worshipped them: after the settlement, he adds, they allowed themselves to be seduced to the worship more than once (pp. 62 sq.).

That totems are occasionally represented upon flags or ensigns appears to be an indubitable fact³, and McLennan's theory that the ensigns of the children of Israel bore totemic clan-crests is not refuted by the objection that the detailed Rabbinical accounts are late, or that the animal metaphors in the blessings of Jacob and of Moses differ⁴. The encamping of the Israelites according to the *'ōthōth* of the fathers' houses (Num. ii. 2), compared with

¹ See Gray's criticisms, *op. cit.*, pp. 99-101.

² Von Kremer, *Studien zur Vergleichenden Culturgeschichte* (Vienna, 1890), II, p. 18. Doughty (*Arabia Deserta*, II, p. 67) has an interesting passage that illustrates Job, *loc. cit.*

³ *EBi.* (= *Encyclopaedia Biblica*), col. 1299, n. 6; see J. F. McLennan, *Studies in Ancient History*, 2nd ser. (London, 1896), pp. 301, 408 (cp. p. 380). Schwally, *Semitische Kriegeraltümer* (Leipzig, 1901), pp. 16 sq., suggests that the Israelite ensigns (*'ōth* and *dégel*) have arisen from war-idols.

⁴ Jacobs, pp. 91 sq.; Zapletal, pp. 114 sq.

the use of 'ōth in Gen. iv. 15, suggests separate group-marks¹: whether these were flags or ensigns (cp. E.V.), or body-marks, need not be discussed here. It is known, too, that the members of a totem-group will mark their totem, or a distinctive part of the same, upon their bodies or upon their property, and Robertson Smith thought it not unlikely that the Arab tribal-marks, branded upon cattle or scratched upon rocks, might be pictorial, and ultimately totemic, in their origin. But the evidence does not appear to be conclusive. Some of the marks are derived from natural objects², though it would be unsafe to assume that the present interpretation set upon them is always correct, others are obviously borrowed from a South Semitic script, and are thus used analogously to the Greek *κομματίας* and *σαμφόρας*, and the Arabic *tiwā*. At all events, the evidence goes to show that the common clan- or family-mark—this, by the way, is said to be the primary meaning of the word “totem”³—exactly corresponds to the old land- and clan-marks of Northern Europe. Now, just as the cattle or property of the group could be marked with a common *wasm*, so it is not unlikely that the group itself could be tattooed or otherwise marked to indicate their relationship one to another and their intimate connexion with their deity. Examples and parallels from the Semitic world are not wanting (*EBi.*, col. 974). In Arabia, the tradition ran that the *wāšīrat*, the woman who serrated her

¹ The 'ōth would indicate the group or moiety to which the individual belonged. In the later religion of Israel the 'ōth is a sign that the individual belongs to Yahwè (cp. Frey, *Tod, Seelenglaube, und Seelenkult im alten Israel*, p. 135; Leipzig, 1898). There is an interesting parallel to Num. ii. in the customs of the N. American Indian tribes on the march: the members of each totem-clan encamp separately according to a specified arrangement (Frazer, *Totemism*, 81; London, 1887).

² It is to be observed that the Ass. *simtu* “image, figure,” and *asumētu* “mark, sign,” like the Palmyrene סמיה[י] (= σίγνον), are probably connected with *wasm* (Jensen, *Die Kosmologie der Babylonier*, p. 349, n. 1; Strassburg, 1890).

³ It is certainly unfortunate that a better term than “totemism” cannot be found to designate the theory which is implied.

teeth, was accursed of Allah, apparently a reference to some heathenish cult. The object of this practice, which originally would hardly be confined to women alone, may find its explanation in a desire to imitate a god. For this parallels might be cited; it may suffice to refer to the peculiar tonsure adopted by the Arabs in honour of their god Orotal, who was supposed to wear his hair in the same way (Herod. iii. 8)¹. The practice of making apparently unmeaning cuts survives in Arabia to the present day. The child's face is gashed shortly after birth, and Burton mentions, as one of the current explanations of this custom, that the child so scarred was thus shown to be "a servant of Allah's house²."

That similar practices were in use among the Hebrews seems almost certain in spite of Zapletal's criticisms. Occasional ceremonial cuttings, whether to attract the attention of a god or on behalf of the dead, are not viewed as directly connected with totemism, and do not come under consideration here. Zapletal's contention that the *kēthōbeth ka'āka'* of Lev. xix. 28 (γράφματα σικτά) refers to an incision or cutting of written characters, which, as they were not animal-representations, could not be regarded as a trace of totemism, seems to be untenable. The term properly denotes a "writing of scratching," and we may be sure that כתב here retains the primary meaning (which is found in "write," *scribo*, and γράφω) of "to score or engrave." That the mark of Cain was evidently some external cutting, probably a tribal-mark, seems to have been proved by Stade, and his conjecture that the prophets of Ahab's

¹ Prof. Haddon (*Head-hunters*, p. 133; London, 1902) observes that the Snake men in Mabuiag had "two small holes in the tip of their noses which were evidently meant to represent the nostrils of the snake." For other imitations see Frazer, *Totemism*, pp. 26 sqq. With regard to the practice of grinding the front teeth, a fairly common custom, Mr. Frazer writes that there is no evidence that this and other mutilations of the teeth are connected with totemism (private communication).

² R. F. Burton, *Pilgrimage to El-Medinah and Meccah* (London, 1857), II, pp. 13, 256 sq.

time bore some outward mark that made them recognizable (1 Kings xx. 38, 41) has been endorsed by Kittel, Benzinger, Holzinger (*Genesis*, p. 51), A. R. S. Kennedy (*Hastings, BD*, III, 871), and others. Finally, there are some grounds for the supposition that the "frontlets" (*tōtāphōth*) were primarily marks or cuts¹. This finds further support in the Syriac *teppēthā* (pl. *teppē*), "point," and it may be conjectured that the Assyrian *taṭāpu*, "encircle," and *tappūtu*, "protection,"² are not unconnected with *tōtāphōth*, since, as it has been seen, the use of the mark or *wasm* contains the idea of tutelage or possession. There seems to be no grounds, therefore, for denying to the Hebrews the practice of making cicatrices and the like in the flesh. It is necessary, however, to observe that it can exist where totemism is unknown, it is no independent proof of the system, and it was not recognized as such by Robertson Smith in his latest utterance (*RS*. 334). The custom appears to indicate simply that the worshipper stood under the direct protection of the god, whether the latter has sprung from a totem would everywhere depend upon the tendency of other evidence.

Forbidden foods have often been held to be a survival of totemism, and since prominence is given in the Old Testament law-books to prohibitions of this nature, it is evident that the subject played no small part in early Israelite religion. Zapletal finds five reasons sufficient to account for the origin of the laws in Lev. xi and Deut. xiv: (1) the fact that the flesh of certain animals

¹ Frey, *op. cit.*, pp. 135 sqq.; Holzinger, *Gen.* p. 51; Baentsch, *Exodus*, pp. 113 sqq.; C. J. Ball, art. "Cuttings," and Prof. Cheyne, art. "Prayer," in *EBi*. It may also be conjectured (though with less confidence) that the *nēkūbīm* or distinguished (lit. "pierced" or "bored") men (Amos vi. 1) were primarily those marked with tattooings. Parallel customs, where only the upper-classes bear tattoo marks, are not wanting (e. g. the Thracians, *Herod.* v. 6).

² The derivation suggested by Fr. Delitzsch. Mention should also be made of Knobel's view, that the word is from an (assumed) root *ḥṭṣ* "to tap," on the analogy of *στρίγματα* from *στρίψω*.

is deleterious; (2) the belief that the flesh of certain animals is harmful to a man's soul; (3) the pedagogic and allegorical explanations as proposed in the first instance by the early fathers; (4) the fact that certain animals would not naturally be eaten; and (5) general feelings of decency and cleanliness which would lead men to refrain from animals which devoured putrid flesh, and so forth. These explanations, it must be admitted, are insufficient, and take no account of the abrogation of the laws in Acts x. 12 sqq.¹ We are bound to infer that there must have been good reason for the prohibitions, consequently certain of the above explanations are futile, as there would be no object in prohibiting an animal which nobody would think of eating. Moreover, when Clement of Alexandria observes that the Egyptians do not touch fish "on account of certain fables, but especially on account of such food making the flesh flabby," we have no difficulty in ascribing the priority to the first-named reason; and, similarly, when in speaking of the Jewish use of goat's flesh he notes that "it is said that the eating of goat's flesh contributes to epilepsy²," we may surmise that had we only one of the "fables" of the Israelites a more plausible explanation would be at hand. But it is impossible to restrict the subject of forbidden foods to Israel alone. No doubt good reasons may be found for considering the flesh of the pig to be injurious. But the pig was not unknown in Palestine (Prov. xi. 22; Matt. viii. 30); it is figured on the sculptures of Egypt and Assyria, in the former country, though an "unclean" animal, it was an annual sacrifice, and in Assyria its flesh was forbidden (only?) on rare occasions³. It was, perhaps, sacred to Bel of Nippur⁴,

¹ More weighty is the view supported by S. Many (art. "Animaux Impurs" in Vigouroux's *Dict. de la Bible*) that the laws have originated from the desire to sever Israel from the surrounding nations.

² *Ante-Nicene Library*, II, p. 430.

³ Jastrow, *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (Boston, 1898), p. 381—in one case the penalty is disease of the joints.

⁴ J. P. Peters, *Nippur*, II, p. 131.

and the sweeping statement has even been made that it was venerated wherever the Adonis cult flourished. Zapletal lays stress, also, upon the absence of forbidden plants (p. 91). But taboos in the vegetable kingdom are everywhere rarer. Examples are found in ancient Egypt and among the Yezīdis, the latter being prohibited the use of lettuces, beans, cabbages, and cucumbers¹; even in Israel itself there was a myth of a forbidden tree in the Garden of Eden², and a curious Rabbinical tradition speaks of sacred trees under which priests sit but may not eat of its fruit³.

An adequate discussion of similar taboos among other peoples⁴, though it would lead to interesting results, would obviously be out of place here. It may suffice to mention that among the forbidden foods are found horses, oxen, antelopes, gazelles, and fowls, not to mention less attractive foods, as cats, dogs, moles, rattlesnakes, and vampire-bats. In the case of certain natives of the Zambesi, the hippopotamus is a taboo and the tribesmen enjoy the flesh of the foul-feeding marabou. The taboos are, as a rule, local, tribal, or national. The vampire-bat is venerated and therefore not eaten in Samoa, whilst the Savage Islanders, not far distant, consider them a delicacy. The reasons which are put forward to explain such taboos are various. The animal is sometimes supposed to be the descendant of a god, or to contain the soul of an ancestor, or the clan affected by the taboo will even regard itself as the descendants of the animal in question. Where the clan is named after an animal it will not only view that animal with a certain superstition and dread, but will refrain from eating it. Finally, it is important to observe that occasionally the tabooed food may only be eaten after a small portion has been given to the gods.

There is reason to believe that a food is forbidden on account of its being associated with some cult or belief⁵,

¹ Parry, *Six Months in a Syrian Monastery*, pp. 371 sqq., 379. According to a native view the lettuce (*khass*) is forbidden on account of the resemblance of the name to that of the prophetess (*Khassa*).

² Compare the Babylonian magic plant that restores old age to youth (*Zeit. für Assyriologie*, XIII, p. 289; Haupt in the *Journ. Amer. Or. Soc.*, XXII, I [1901]).

³ Gemārā on 'Abōdāh zārāh, III, 11.

⁴ The following notes are taken from McLennan's *Studies*, 2nd ser.

⁵ So, in the Koran, forbidden food is that over which the name of

and in support of this Bertholet (*Comm.* on Lev. xi) has collected an imposing number of evidences to show that the animals forbidden to the Israelites played a prominent part in some Semitic rite, or were in one way or another the object of superstitious regard. The gazelle, though not mentioned as a forbidden food in Israel, was tabooed to the Yezīdīs; it was connected with the worship of the Phœnician Ashtōreth and the corresponding Arabian goddess al-'Uzza, and it is curious to find that the Banū Hārith of South Arabia, on finding the dead body of a gazelle, would bury it like a man, and mourn for it as a kinsman. "Simeon Stylites forbade his Saracen converts to eat the flesh of the camel, which was the chief element in the sacrificial meals of the Arabs, and our own prejudice against the use of horse flesh is [probably] a relic of an old ecclesiastical prohibition framed at the time when the eating of such food was an act of worship to Odin¹." Among the Syrians fish were sacred to Atargatis (Derceto), and it was believed that if they ate a sprat or an anchovy they would be visited with a wasting disease². That a penalty is attached to prohibitions of this nature is important. Similarly, Dr. Frazer³ cites a New Guinea belief that if any one tried to lay hands upon a refugee in the *dubu* or temple, which serves as an asylum, his legs and arms would shrivel up. To a certain extent it may be said that the refugee is the possession of the *numen*, who thus avenges himself for an affront upon his property⁴. It is on the same analogy that in Palestine

a god other than Allah has been invoked (*Sûr.* V, 4, XVI, 116, &c.). S. Reinach (*Revue Scientifique*, Oct. 13, 1900, p. 451, col. 1, n. 1) observes that the Russian peasant of to-day will not kill the dove on account of its association with the Holy Spirit.

¹ Robertson Smith, *The Old Test. in the Jewish Church*, 2nd ed., p. 367.

² For a series of similar penalties cp. Frazer, *Totemism*, pp. 16 sqq.

³ *Fortnightly Review*, April, 1899, p. 651.

⁴ The abode of the god constitutes the sanctuary; thus in Persia (where the horse is a sacred animal) the stable is an asylum (*Folk-Lore*, XII, p. 269 [1901]).

the guardian saint is supposed to punish the man who removes a piece of wood from the forest or bushes around his abode, or attacks the man or animal that trespasses or feeds upon his grounds; and it is for this reason that the modern bedouin will still store his food or fuel near a holy grave, confident that it will be untouched¹. The thing is sacrosanct because it is "holy." But it is very important to bear in mind that mere ideas of property do not cover the whole ground². Taboos exist where there is no clearly defined god, and it is quite as likely that a tomb should be placed in a sacred locality as that a spot should have the reputation of sanctity through the presence of a tomb. Taboos may arise from the most varied circumstances, but no discussion of Semitic taboos is possible without a consideration of the conceptions underlying the use of the terms "clean" and "unclean³," and it is Zapletal's failure to realize this that weakens his attempt to explain the laws of forbidden food. Among the many survivals of the idea in Talmudic times we may probably include the circumstance that the later Rabbis disapproved of the barber's trade on account of his association with ceremonial tonsures⁴; such a person may well have been deemed "unclean." Similarly, drivers of asses and camels may have been abominated because the latter was an unclean animal (note its occurrence in the list of forbidden foods), and on account of the probable connexion of the former with Jewish heathenism (though absolute proof is wanting, *RS.*, p. 468). Possibly, too, the

¹ *PEFQ.* (= *Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statements*), 1893, pp. 216, 219; cp. 1873, p. 86; 1875, p. 210; 1877, p. 91; 1879, pp. 46 sq. It is pertinent to observe that the use of a church as a storehouse has often been noted in North Syria and elsewhere.

² Thus Zapletal's view (pp. 127 sq.) that the animals in a sacred tract—the *ḥimā*—were dedicated to a deity, and therefore the property of a deity, misses the point, and fails to take account of the argument in *RS.*, pp. 142 sq., 145 sq., 153 sq., 288, n. 1.

³ See, fully, Mr. G. A. Simcox's article in *EBi.*, col. 836 sqq.

⁴ *EBi.*, col. 507, n. 5.

tanner was obliged to carry on his evil-smelling craft outside the precincts of the city because of his dealings with the skins of sacrificial beasts, and an analogy for this is found in the Hill Tribes of Central India, where the Chamâr, primarily a tanner or currier, from his association with hides, in particular those of the sacred ox, is detested by orthodox Hindus¹. The most reasonable conclusion we may draw is that there are sure and certain survivals of animal-worship among the Hebrews, and, since they appear in the guise of forbidden foods, it is probable that the animals were at some time regarded as closely allied to clans or communities of men. To what extent the ideas of incarnation-animals and the transmigration of souls may lie at the bottom of this it is hard to say. At all events the principle belongs, as does also the doctrine of totem-animals, to the same general theory of animal-worship, but the identification of the two does not hold good without independent support in other directions².

Robertson Smith's important theory of the totem-sacrifice, a fuller consideration of which in the light of the present evidence was to be expected, is unfortunately handled with disproportionate briefness (pp. 92-105), and Zapletal's criticisms in the main only affect points of detail. His conclusion that sacrifice is a recognition that God is the highest ruler and that man owes Him his life is of course true for Israel. It was the ideal conception, but it is scarcely primitive. The claim of divine ancestry, he states, is due to a desire for flattery, or to a high grade of veneration. This, again, is partly true, but does not appear to go deep enough. "To claim divine descent and an especial sacredness for the ruling house is no peculiarity of the East, or any other part of the world," and the evidence for cults in the Hellenic world has been collected by Mr. E. R. Bevan³. It is noteworthy that the divine official

¹ *Journ. Anthropol. Inst.*, XXVIII (1899), p. 226.

² Cp. Prof. Tylor, "Remarks on Totemism," *Journ. Anthropol. Inst.*, XXVIII (1899), pp. 142 sq.

³ *English Historical Review*, Oct. 1901, pp. 625-639.

surnames are not *claimed* by the holder, but *conferred* by the people¹, and the evidence clearly shows how easily the king and god could be identified one with the other. In this connexion it may be added that Zapletal (pp. 132 sqq.) finds no survival of heathen mythology in the ancient fragment Gen. vi. 2-4. His view that the *bēnē Elōhīm* are mere ordinary men seems improbable; the mythological interpretation is the more natural, and is as early as the Septuagint translation and the Book of Enoch². Further, he holds to the opinion that the proper names consisting of the divine name compounded with a term of relationship do not imply a physical tie—a view more easily asserted than proved. Mr. G. B. Gray, in fact, has shown that such names go back to early times, and were not confined to Israel alone. Strangely enough, they commence to fall into disuse “just when the deeper ideas of the fatherhood of God were developing,” and the existence of parallel compounds of *ah* (e.g. Abijah, “brother is Yah”) forbid our interpreting them in a spiritual sense³. Whether the veneration of domestic animals is an important item in the theory of totemism or not, Zapletal’s opinion, that it has arisen from the desire of the whole tribe to control the killing of beasts which provide them with food and clothing (pp. 98 sq., cp. 74) is hardly convincing. It does not explain the dedication of the cow among the Todas, or the fact that the butcher among the Troglodyte nomads of East Africa was unclean, or even the opprobrious reproach, “you kill your cattle,” hurled at the heads of the men of *Jōbar*⁴.

In his chapter on the *jinn* Zapletal criticizes the evidence for the totemic origin of a belief in demons. The

¹ Op. cit., p. 629.

² See R. H. Charles, *Book of Enoch* (Oxford, 1893), chapters X-XVI.

³ Gray, *Hebrew Proper Names*, pp. 252-254.

⁴ J. G. Wetzstein in *Zeit. d. Morgenländ. Gesell.*, XI [1857], p. 488. Even Kremer (*Studien*, ii. pp. 86 sq.) observes that the fact remains that there is a decided reluctance to kill and eat cattle except on special occasions.

nature of the Arabic *jinn* has been recently handled by Westermarck¹, whose criticisms are well worthy of serious consideration. This writer clearly shows that the *jinn* are not necessarily the denizens of places frequented by wild beasts, that they are commonly man's enemies, and that they are, broadly speaking, beings "invented to explain what seems to fall outside the pale of nature." Their general resemblance to the fairies, trolls, and goblins of Europe has been noted by Mr. Lang², and like these, it may be added, they sometimes appear in a more friendly or, sometimes even, a mischievous guise. In modern Lebanon the *jinn* will "sometimes perform kindnesses to the poor and distressed by multiplying their meal, or causing mills to grind extra-quickly. In these cases they manifest themselves as old men of the mountains"³. That the Israelites shared with the Arabs a belief in the *jinn* seems certain from the numerous survivals of demonism in later times. Zapletal, however, holds that it is by no means certain that the *šē'irīm* of Isa. xiii. 21 are demons, they are more probably wild-goats (p. 123). Elsewhere (pp. 74 sq.) he observes that living animals were not worshipped by the Hebrews, and that in Lev. xvii. 7, 2 Chron. xi. 15, the term is an opprobrious epithet for demons which were supposed to have the form of goats. No notice is taken of the *šēdīm* to whom sacrifices were offered (Deut. xxxii. 17), or of the story of Hiel (1 Kings xvi. 34), where comparative anthropology teaches us to recognize a special kind of sacrifice to supernatural powers⁴.

¹ *Journ. Anthropol. Inst.*, XXIX (1899), pp. 252-269.

² *Op. cit.*, XXX (1900), no. 17.

³ *Folk-Lore*, IX (1898), p. 19. Cp. also *ib.*, XI (1900), 390, and *PEFQ*, 1893, pp. 215 sq. Modern Palestinian folk-lore, too, has its stories of people who dance and sing at night-time, and suddenly disappear when the name of God is mentioned.

⁴ For parallels see *EBi.*, col. 2063; Schwally, *op. cit.*, pp. 92 sq.; *Journ. Anthropol. Inst.*, XXIX (1899), p. 262, and *Folk-Lore*, IX (1898), p. 16, where mention is made of sacrifices of sheep or oxen in Lebanon at the finishing

In the concluding chapter Zapletal turns to the vexed question of exogamy and matriarchy. He finds no traces of promiscuity; female infanticide may have arisen through poverty, and polygamy, which plays an important part among the Semites, points to patriarchy. The alleged evidences in favour of matriarchy in the Old Testament he explains as due to the well-known psychological fact that a more tender relation always exists between mother and child. Exogamy, as a custom, may have arisen elsewhere from a lack of women, or, more especially in the case of the rich and noble, from a desire to enter into alliance with reputable families¹. He holds that the mention of a man's mother, and not father, in magical ceremonies admits of an explanation other than matriarchy (p. 159, n. 2), thus differing from Nöldeke, who on the same grounds suspected a survival of matriarchy among the Mandeans (p. 139, n. 3). Opinion will probably be divided as to the weight to be attached to Gen. ii. 24. That *in the mind of the narrator* the words had a psychological meaning (Holzinger, *Genesis*, p. 30) may well be granted, the question whether they originally indicated matriarchy (Gunkel, *ad loc.*) depends upon the view taken of the other evidences of the custom in the Old Testament. Zapletal's discussion of marriage with half-sisters is meagre, and the existence of prohibitory laws in Deut. xxvii. 22; Lev. xviii. 9, 11; xx. 17 (cp. Ezek. xxii. 11), carries more weight than his explanation of 2 Sam. xiii (p. 166). In regard to the marriage of son and step-mother no point is made by the remark that in the case of Reuben and Bilhah the present conclusion of the narrative (Gen. xxxv. 22) is abrupt, and that doubtless a word of blame originally followed. Nor is it helpful to insist that in 2 Sam. xvi. 22 concubines and not wives are mentioned, the tone of the narrative here, as also in iii. 7 and 1 Kings ii. 13-25, suggests that we have to do with an act of presumption rather than an unheard-of crime.

Zapletal's main thesis is the denial that the Israelites—

of a house, also at the opening of the Beirût-Damascus railway. The animal has here taken the place of a human victim; cp. J. G. Frazer, *Journal of Philology*, XIV (1885), p. 156. The whole subject is voluminously treated by Paul Sartori, "Ueber das Bauopfer," in the *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, 1898, Jan., pp. 1 sqq.

¹ The argument is unsound, endogamy would be equally natural among rich families. It may be noticed that, according to Prof. Tylor (*Nineteenth Century*, July, 1896, p. 92), whereas maternal peoples are endogamous, exogamous peoples do not necessarily retain matriarchy, but may be either maternal or paternal, clanship being reckoned on the mother's or father's side accordingly.

incidentally, also, as we gather, that the Semites—were totemists. If I am not mistaken, he would go further and deny all traces of fetichism or animism in general. Now, it is to be remembered that Robertson Smith himself does not go so far as to lay down any formulated account of the totemism of Israel. In 1880 he concluded that “the superstitions with which the spiritual religion had to contend were not one whit less degrading than those of the most savage nations. . . . It does not appear that Israel was, by its own wisdom, more fit than any other nation to rise above the lowest level of heathenism¹.” In 1894 his opinion of Semitic totemism may, I think, be conveniently summarized in these words²: “At the stage which even the rudest Semitic peoples had reached when they first become known to us, it would be absurd to expect to find examples of totemism pure and simple. What we may expect to find is the fragmentary survival of totem ideas, in the shape of special associations between certain kinds of animals on the one hand, and certain tribes or religious communities and their gods on the other hand.” Considering the monotheistic ideals of the prophets and teachers in Israel, the incessant war against heathenism, and the redaction that the books of the Old Testament have undergone, it is not to be expected that survivals should be numerous. It is to the people not to the prophets, to the lore and not to the literature, that we must look for further evidence. “Neglected by sacred poets, it will linger among the superstitions of the rustics³.” Experience shows that primitive superstitions and beliefs are almost ineradicable. Wave after wave of foreign population may flood a country

¹ *Journal of Philology*, IX (1880), p. 100.

² *RS.*, p. 444. Cp. F. B. Jevons, *Introduction to the History of Religion*, p. 127: “Among the Semites, as amongst the Aryans, we nowhere find totemism a living organism, though we find all the *disjecti membra*.”

³ Similarly, traces of fetichism in the oldest Aryan literature are found only in the relics of popular poetry connected with charms, imprecations and other superstitious usages (*Lang, Custom and Myth*, p. 241).

without destroying the germs of its early rites and cults, and, as is often the case, the conquerors may be physically conquered by the people they have beaten. That this is true of the Semitic world is abundantly proved by the presence of the same physical types that were in existence nearly three thousand years ago, and by the survival of rites and beliefs closely parallel with, if not identical to, those of the earliest times. It is no great matter for surprise—though the evidence is none the less acceptable—that a complete pillar-cult should have survived to the present day in Upper Macedonia; the suppliant kisses and embraces the sacred stone and drinks thrice from the water of an adjacent holy spring mingled with earth from a sacred grave at the head of which grows a thorn-tree hung with rags¹. There is still room for a collection of the evidences of Semitic heathenism past and present. “Much of Talmudic ritual carries on the face of it evidence of more archaic ritual than the more ideal codes of Ezekiel and the Pentateuch²,” and the prevalence of genuine Semitic heathen beliefs under a veneer of Mohammedanism is abundantly vouched for among the modern fellahin and bedouin.

There seems to be a tendency in Zapletal's book to sever the early religion of Israel from that of the surrounding Semites in a manner hardly warranted by the evidence. He is at pains to show that we know too little of the early home of the Semites to infer that Israelite beliefs are to be explained in the same manner as Arabian parallels (p. 25), although there is no sound reason why Israel should not have possessed the same ideas and superstitions as other nomadic Semites. This, the most natural view, is held

¹ A. J. Evans, *The Mycenaean Tree and Pillar Cult* (London, 1901), pp. 102-106. With the meal referred to, we may compare, *inter alia*, the Yezidi custom of eating of the dust from the tomb of the patron Sheikh Adî on the occasion of a marriage ceremony. The mere possession of the sacred earth is viewed as a blessing (*Journal Asiatique*, 9th ser., t. 7 [1896], pp. 111, 126, and 115, 130).

² Jacobs, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

by the great majority of critics of the Old Testament. As Prof. Driver has said:—

“The general result of the archaeological and anthropological researches of the past half-century has been to take the Hebrews out of the isolated position which, as a nation, they seemed previously to hold.... Their beliefs... their social usages... their religious institutions, can no longer be viewed, as was once possible, as differing in kind from those of other nations, and determined in every feature by a direct revelation from Heaven; all, it is now known, have substantial analogies among other peoples¹.”

The curious rite of the Ordeal of Jealousy, the superstitious fear of iron in holy places², ritual dances³, scape-goats, speaking trees, and stars imbued with life, are among the indications that Israel was no different to other primitive peoples. Israel came out of the desert, the home of infantile beliefs and ideas. Yahwism was hostile to Israel's older beliefs, and in spite of the polemics of prophets and the prohibitions of priestly schools did not succeed in eradicating its early inheritance of heathenism and superstition⁴. Polytheism (or, better, polydemonism) prevailed in Israel, as among her neighbours, although the plural form

¹ *Authority and Archaeology* (London, 1899), pp. 6 sq.

² Exod. xx. 25; Deut. xxvii. 5; Joshua viii. 31; 1 Kings vi. 7. Aben Ezra's conjecture that the fear is connected with some abomination (פסול), and that the touch of iron would profane (יחל) the stone, is singularly luminous. This conservatism is easily paralleled. Going back a stage in human culture, we find the savages of Central Australia retaining the fire-stick (a piece of bark) on the occasion of initiatory ceremonies and the like, long after they have become acquainted with the use of implements of stone (Spencer and Gillen, *Indian Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 401).

³ Dances round trees are still kept up in Lebanon (*Folk-Lore*, IX, pp. 8 sq., 15 sq.); also elsewhere on the occasion of vows and sacrifices, though the practice is considered sinful (*PEFQ.*, 1893, p. 208).

⁴ Its partial success is seen in the almost entire absence of dolmens within the borders of Israel, and in the small number of rock-carvings and pottery-figures among the finds of recent explorers (cp. C. R. Conder, *Palestine*, pp. 110, 115 sq., 155 sq.). On the other hand, it is remarkable to find animals portrayed upon Galilean synagogues, particularly when the animals in question include the “unclean” hare (*ibid.*, pp. 90 sq.).

ēlōhīm, as Zapletal and Nöldeke agree, is no proof for the same¹.

There is not the slightest doubt that many of the later cults and beliefs in Israel were derived from the settled Canaanite inhabitants of the land, and a distinction can often be drawn between the religious and social practices of a nomad pastoral folk, and those of settled agriculturists open to the civilization of neighbouring powers². It may be questioned, however, whether any system of "ethnology in folk-lore" would allow us to do this thoroughly. There are, perhaps, too many factors to be taken into consideration. In addition to the specifically Canaanite cults (forms of nature-worship connected with agriculture), the rites and practices directly or indirectly borrowed from Babylonia (astral cults, sexual licence, &c.)³, and the importations of Aramaean origin (Gad and Meni, Tophet⁴)—the evidence for so-called Turanian or Accadian survivals is of the slightest—we have now to face the possibility of traces of Mycenaean culture and beliefs in Canaan, and (may we add?) in Israel⁵. At all events it is worth noting that the Mycenaean sacred animals include the ass, lion, bull, stag, horse, goat and pig, though it would be unsafe

¹ Nöldeke, *ZDMG.*, XLII, p. 476; Zapletal, pp. 129 sq. The latter, however, does not admit that polytheism has been proved for Israel (*Revue Biblique*, Oct. 1901, p. 651).

² The very presence of the civilizations of Assyria and Egypt is sometimes taken to support the view that Israel was scarcely deficient in culture previous to the settlement in Canaan. So, for example, Hommel (*Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, pp. 229 sq.). But a definite impulse led the Hebrews to Canaan, had it not been for which they would assuredly have remained a nomadic people like the Aramaeans, who, as Hommel himself justly observes (p. 208), "would seem to have offered the same resistance to Babylonian civilization as was always displayed by the Bedûn Arab tribes in Palestine."

³ Cp. *EBi.*, col. 1965.

⁴ The name Tophet, at least, may be Aramaean (*RS.*, p. 377).

⁵ Sayce, *Amer. Journ. of Theology*, V (1901), pp. 700 sq.; F. B. Welch, "The Influence of the Aegean Civilisation on S. Palestine" (*PEFQ.*, Oct. 1900, pp. 342-350).

to base any theories upon this list alone¹. Horse-worship for the Semites and Mycenaeans would find a common starting-point in Persia or Armenia, but it would be unwise to treat every parallel as due to a common source².

Thus the suggestion that the tree- and pillar-cults of the Semites and Mycenaeans have been borrowed from a common source in the form of a pre-Aryan, pre-Semitic race of Asia Minor³ goes much too far. So widespread a custom cannot have been derived from one fountain-head. To assume too hastily that the existence of a similar cult or custom among peoples is due to borrowing is as rash as for the philologist to endeavour to trace a historical connexion between the languages of the agglutinative group. That the greatest caution is required is naturally obvious, a foreign cult may be so grafted upon a religion that it can become regarded as part of the original stock; an illustrative example of this is to be seen in the sporadic traces of a Tammuz-Adonis cult in the Mohammedan festival of Hosein⁴.

Enough has been said, perhaps, to illustrate the lines upon which the latest opponent of Robertson Smith's theory has worked, and to indicate our opinion of the general inadequacy of Professor Zapletal's criticisms. Notwithstanding this, let it be remembered that his book has undoubtedly the merit of pointing out the weak places in the totem-theory. It is possible that retrenchment may be found necessary in certain side-issues, but the question of Semitic totemism must still be confessed to be *sub judice* until the whole of the available evidence from the entire Semitic field has been studied in the light of

¹ A. B. Cook, "Animal Worship in the Mycenaean Age" in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XIV (1894), pp. 81 sqq.; see especially pp. 157 sqq. Mr. Cook, who suggests that the Mycenaeans were not totemists pure and simple, observes that the indications point to their worship having been developed out of an earlier totemism.

² Cp. d'Alviella, *Rev. de l'Histoire des Religions*, XLIV (1901), pp. 1-15, who shows that analogies may spring from (1) a common heritage, (2) intentional or accidental borrowing, and (3) parallel formation.

³ *Nature*, Nov. 14, 1901, suppl. p. viii.

⁴ *RS.*, p. 321, n. 4; B. D. Eerdmans, *Zeit. f. Ass.*, IX (1894), pp. 280-307; Von Kremer, *Studien*, II, pp. 84 sq.

our growing knowledge of totemism in other parts of the world. To a brief consideration of this we now turn.

Totemism, it may be said, is essentially a product of the English school. English writers have familiarized the study, and it is due to English research that it may now be said to have entered upon a new stage. The admirable labours of Messrs. Spencer and Gillen among the tribes of Central Australia have brought to light a system of totemism differing in essential particulars from the systems already known to us; and although their discoveries have necessitated a reconsideration of the whole theory, they have this unique value that "they seem to point to a solution more complete and satisfactory than any that has hitherto been offered"¹. The facts are these: among the Arunta, a representative tribe, the belief prevails that the members of the totem-group are the descendants of semi-human ancestors intimately associated, if not actually identical, with the animals (or plants) after which they are named. These ancestors roamed over the country in totem-groups, carrying sacred stones called *Churinga*, which, as Dr. Frazer has pointed out, seem to represent the external soul of folk-lore. At certain well-known spots a number of ancestors went into the ground carrying the *Churinga* with them. Their spirits continue to haunt these places, and, entering into women, become reincarnated². Whatever be the totem of the mother or the father, that of the child rests upon the locality where the mother believes that she

¹ J. G. Frazer, "The Origin of Totemism," *Fortnightly Review*, May, 1901, p. 852. On the whole subject see Prof. Baldwin Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (London, 1899), *Journ. Anthropol. Inst.*, XXVIII (1899), pp. 275 sqq., 281 sqq., and Frazer's articles, *Fortn. Rev.*, 1901, pp. 647 sqq., 835 sqq.

² Mr. R. H. Mathews (*Queensland Geographical Journal*, new ser., XVI, p. 85) has recorded a somewhat similar idea: infants live in rocky hills and forest trees before birth. It is worth noticing that the Arunta happen to be the only recorded tribe who have a belief in an immaculate conception. Natural death is an unknown idea among them, and every death is supposed to be due to the magic influence of some malevolent person, and steps are taken to avenge it.

has conceived. The totems, therefore, are strictly local, though what may be called local centres of any one totem may be found in various districts of the area occupied by the tribe.

In addition to the *Churinga*, the ancestors carried about with them a *Nurtunja*, or sacred pole, emblematic of the totem. They were, too, the originators of certain ceremonies, of the nature of sympathetic magic, called *Intichiuma*, whereby each totem-group endeavoured to gain control over the object after which it is named. Thus, the men of the kangaroo, emu, and other groups respectively, perform magical rites to secure an increase of the article of food in question, the men of the Hakea Flower totem or of the mulga tree each multiply their totem, the Rain men secure due measure of rain, and so the whole of nature is partitioned out among the tribe. "In the case of many of the totems, it is just when there is promise of the approach of a good season that it is customary to hold the ceremonies¹." These magical ceremonies, therefore, would find their analogy in the well-known spring or midsummer festivals of Europe, and, needless to say, predominate wherever the supply of food and water is uncertain owing to the climate and other considerations.

Now it is remarkable that, although the rule that the totem-animal or plant must not be killed or eaten by the totem-group is very generally observed at the present day, the traditions unambiguously point to a time when the ancestors both killed and ate their totem, not occasionally, but regularly. But, on the occasion of these *Intichiuma* ceremonies the leading members of the totem-group have the first right to the animal or plant whose increase they endeavour to procure, and not only this, it is absolutely necessary for them, and especially for the head man, to eat a little of it. To eat none on these occasions would be as dangerous as to eat too freely of it at other times:

¹ Spencer and Gillen, *op. cit.*, pp. 169 sq.

it is essential to the success of the ceremony. Not only does each totem-group work for the benefit of the others, but a man will sometimes actually take a very active part in helping others to charm and kill his own totem. If, on the other hand, the totem is dangerous, it would be the aim of the group to curb, control, or nullify its propensities. Hence, as Dr. Frazer suggests, from the Arab belief that the blood of men of noble rank is a cure for hydrophobia, we may conjecture that the men were descendants of a dog totem-group¹.

From a consideration of the Central Australian data Dr. Frazer and Prof. Baldwin Spencer independently reached an explanation of the meaning of totemism which, if correct, completely revolutionizes our conceptions of the system. "It is not so much a religious as an economic system," writes Dr. Frazer²; "it is not a *worship* of nature, but a mode of exploiting nature by means of magic for the common good. It is especially (but by no means only) a system of providing, by means which seem to the savage natural and reasonable (not supernatural and mysterious), for the food supply. It is the business of a man whose totem is an edible animal, to multiply animals of that sort in order that they may be killed and eaten. It is the business of a man whose totem is an edible plant, to multiply plants of that sort in order that they may be gathered and eaten. The functions of the two correspond to those of the grazier, the farmer, and (to some extent apparently) the butcher with us. They breed animals for eating (and seem sometimes to kill or help others to kill them), and they grow roots and plants also for eating. The means they employ are, indeed, irrational and absurd (for they are magical), but the

¹ RS., pp. 368 sq. The belief was fairly prevalent, cp. Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heidentums*, 1st ed., p. 142, 2nd ed., p. 162. Marillier would associate the belief with the magical properties ascribed generally to royal personages (*Revue de l'Hist. des Rel.*, XXXVII, p. 210).

² In a private communication.

intentions of the men answer exactly to those of our graziers and farmers."

Ceremonies more or less analogous to the *Intichiuma* are not wanting¹, and Dr. Frazer writes that the drift of the latest evidence seems to confirm the above explanation of the meaning of totemism. Messrs. Spencer and Gillen "have during the last year been exploring the tribes to the north of those formerly examined by them, and one of the results of the new information (communicated to him in letters by Prof. Baldwin Spencer) is to prove the correctness, for the Central Australians at least, of the more or less hypothetical explanation of totemism put forward on the basis of the previously ascertained facts. According to Prof. Haddon, there are some grounds, also, for thinking that the same explanation will apply to the totemism of the Papuan peoples². Further, certain indications lead us to anticipate that the same thing will prove to be true of the well-developed totemic system of the Baganda in Central Africa, though as yet it would be premature to speak with confidence on the subject. The matter is receiving careful attention. Should it turn out, however, that what we may call the economic theory of totemism explains the system as we find it in Central Australia, the Papuan area, and Central Africa, we might almost conclude, with a fair degree of probability, that the same explanation would hold good of totemism everywhere, if only the facts were sufficiently ascertained, which, unfortunately, they seldom are³."

The immense importance of this evidence is clear. Hitherto only a very limited number of cases was known where an animal, apparently sacred, and *ex hyp.* a totem, was solemnly killed, but in no instance was there a clear proof of the eating of the animal by the group, the essential part of Robertson Smith's theory of the totem-sacrifice (*RS.*, pp. 294 sq.). Now, at last, in the *Intichiuma* ceremonies we have authenticated cases of a practice which he had conjectured though without any certain example. It is to be noted, however, that there is nothing abstract or mysterious about the rite. No theologically abstract idea

¹ *Fortnightly Review*, 1901, pp. 846 sq.; cp. R. H. Mathews, *Queensland Geogr. Journal*, new series, XVI, p. 81.

² A. C. Haddon, *Head-hunters*, p. 134 (London, 1902).

³ Even the *Intichiuma* rites escaped the notice of Europeans until quite recently.

of communion underlies it. It is a piece of practical co-operative magic, and is based upon a utilitarian motive¹.

Herein lies the great distinction between the "totem sacrament" of Robertson Smith's theory and the actual evidence of the Central Australian rites. Robertson Smith's theory inferred, to quote Dr. Frazer again, "a totem community united in reverence, awe, and love of the totem animal, solemnly and sorrowfully killing it once a year, and partaking of its flesh, not as common food to fill their stomachs, but as a means of entering into a mystic communion with the divine animal. What are the facts? We find a community of which the greater part regularly kills and eats the animal in question whenever they can lay hands on it, whilst the remaining section (which has the animal for its totem) does its best to multiply the creature in order that all the rest of the people may devour it. And since, in order to breed the animal for eating, they think it necessary to have part of its substance in their bodies, they do ceremonially partake of its flesh, not in order to acquire certain mysterious divine qualities, but ultimately in order that the majority of their fellows may feed on roast kangaroo, roast emu, or whatever it may be. Instead of a mystic religious rite like the Christian sacrament of the Eucharist (which was clearly in Robertson Smith's mind), we see a magical ceremony of the most practical and business-like intention². The difference is that between the spiritual religion of a highly cultured European and the crude, grossly materialistic magic of the

¹ With this compare Mr. Jacobs' remarkably acute criticism of Robertson Smith's theory (*Studies*, pp. 33 sq.): "The whole idea of communion seems to me too theologically abstract to be at the basis of savage rites of sacrifice. For these we must look to some utilitarian motive, based, it may be, on some savage and seemingly absurd idea, but logically deduced from it." The author of the too little known *Studies in Biblical Archaeology* has exactly hit the mark in these words, which were written at least twelve years ago.

² Cp. also Frazer, "On some Ceremonies of the Central Australian Tribes," a paper read before the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science, 1900, pp. 315 sq.

primitive Australian savage. Further, the relation of the group to the totem cannot properly, it seems to me, be described as worship. In worship the worshipper confesses his inferiority to the being worshipped. In the Central Australian ceremonies for the multiplication of plants and animals the man no more confesses his inferiority to his totem than (to recur to the simile employed above) a cattle-breeder confesses his inferiority to his cow, or a farmer to his wheat. Quite apart from this, it is a mistake to speak of a totem as a god. A totem may have often developed into a god (though this is not certain), but it is hardly any more a god than a seed is a tree because it may grow into one. . . . On the whole, the thing that seems to come out most strongly in the relation of a man to his totem is his identification with it; he becomes, as far as may be, a creature of the same sort as his totem. If his totem is a kangaroo, then his creed is, not that the kangaroo is his god, but that he himself is a kangaroo as near as may be¹."

I have gladly availed myself of Dr. Frazer's permission to quote his statement of the difference between the theoretical "totem sacrament" and the actual evidence of the *Intichiuma* ceremonies, since it is not unlikely that the divergence between the two may not have been fully realized. At the same time it is necessary to estimate the bearing of the new evidence upon Robertson Smith's theory at its proper worth. There is no one, I imagine, who, because Robertson Smith's explanation of certain Semitic sacrificial phenomena, which had never before been fairly studied in the light of comparative anthropology, proves to be without probability, will appreciate his unequalled wealth of resource or critical insight the less. Few Orientalists are anthropologists, and the happy combina-

¹ The principle was stated long ago (Frazer, *Totemism*, p. 3), though it was not clear why the man should have identified himself with his totem. The new evidence now makes it abundantly plain that by this means he is able to control and direct the species for the common good—multiplying it if edible, controlling or propitiating it if dangerous or destructive. That little distinction is made between the man and his totem appears, for example, in two aboriginal drawings cited by Mr. R. H. Mathews (*Queensland Geogr. Journ.*, XIV, pp. 10 sq. [1898-9]), where an emu and a kangaroo are depicted with a shield.

tion in the person of Robertson Smith will doubtless long remain unparalleled¹.

Further important discoveries were made by Messrs. Spencer and Gillen regarding the social organization of the Central Australian tribes. It was found that one set of tribes strictly observed the familiar rule that a man must not marry a woman of his totem, whilst in another, of which the Arunta may be regarded as representative, totemism has no effect upon either marriage or descent. In addition to this, the traditions of the Arunta clearly point to a time when men and women of one totem lived together, and a man never married a woman who was not of his totem. This novel though not illogical idea further complicates the problem of the origin of exogamy.

It is very important to notice—what has been often observed—that climatic and other considerations have some bearing on the problem. In studying the structure of the South Australian tribes, Mr. Howitt² found that the most backward types of social organization, with descent through the mother, and an archaic form of communal marriage, existed in the dry and desert country. In the more genial districts descent through the mother still survived, but of the communal or group-marriage only relics remained. Finally, in fertile districts where food abounded, descent was counted through the father, and individual marriage prevailed. The last-mentioned stage is that now reached

¹ I venture in this connexion to quote from a letter from Dr. Frazer: "If you cite my reasons for questioning the correctness of Robertson Smith's theory of the 'totem sacrament,' I hope you will make it clear that I continue, as ever, to hold in high respect and admiration the work of a very dear friend, whose vast superiority both in learning and in intellect I have always been proud and happy to recognize. He was a tower of strength in whose shadow his friends rested and felt safe. . . It is the reverse of pleasant to me to express dissent from him. But no man, however great his genius, could see to the bottom of a subject in which the data are so imperfect as they were in regard to totemism in Robertson Smith's lifetime. The wonder is not that he did not see further, but that he saw so far."

² See Mr. E. S. Hartland in *Folk-Lore*, XI (1900), pp. 71 sq.

by the Arunta tribe¹, whence it would appear that their totem-system has already undergone some development. Already we find the germs of a priesthood, and of cities of asylum; the totem-system is plainly territorial, and, as Mr. Hartland conjectures, is gradually developing into something similar to the societies of British Columbia².

Space forbids a fuller discussion of these and of the numerous other points of interest which Messrs. Spencer and Gillen's work has raised. In spite of the very meagre account we have given of the totemism of the Arunta enough has perhaps been said to indicate its importance for the totem-theory, though it is well to keep before us always the possibility that the traditions of a primitive endogamy and of a time when the clan killed and ate its totem-animal area etiological³.

With reference to the foregoing evidence from Central Australia it is necessary to guard against viewing all analogies elsewhere as actual evidences of an original totemism. Neither the European festivals which Mannhardt and Frazer have interpreted as originally charms for the revival of vegetation, nor any other examples of sympathetic magic are, taken by themselves, evidences of totemism. But they *are* analogies, and it is one of the many valuable features of the Australian evidence that it reveals a people who do still take part and believe in ceremonies which are almost extinct in Europe, the meaning of which has for long been forgotten by the participants themselves.

We still know too little to lay it down that the system of economics revealed in the *Intichiuma* is an essential of totemism⁴, and con-

¹ With this qualification, however, that the child belongs to the same exogamous moiety of the tribe as his father.

² See Mr. E. S. Hartland in *Folk-Lore*, XI (1900), pp. 74 sq. These societies are comparatively modern, and are quite independent of the totem-system there in vogue; each group is under the special protection of a single spirit.

³ See, for the former, Mr. Hartland, *Folk-Lore*, XI (1900), p. 76, for the latter, M. Hubert, *L'Année Sociologique*, III (1900), p. 215. Endogamy seems to have preceded exogamy among the Yakuts, so according to Sieroshevski (W. G. Sumner, *Journ. Anthropol. Soc.*, 1901, pp. 88 sq.).

⁴ Similarly, the *tapu* (taboo) has frequently a very practical and intelligible purpose—that of enforcing a 'close' period (cp. Lang, *Magic and*

sequently it is not easy to determine the evolution which such ceremonies could undergo. We can scarcely go so far as to suggest that the co-operative method of procuring food would lead to the institution of hereditary trades and professions, or of organized guilds, although Prof. Haddon tells us that "though rain is not a totem the office of 'rain-maker' was hereditary in Mabuiag, and consequently rain-making would be the function of a particular family¹." But the evidence for "departmental totemism"—if we may so call it—is at present of the slightest.

It is particularly interesting to find that among the tribes of the Northern Territory of South Australia "some of the old men, the shamans of the tribe, profess to have the power of causing the supply of animals, fruit, vegetables, roots, and other sources of food to increase²." If wild-ducks are desired a man of the wild-duck totem officiates, and so on. In time the importance attached to the aid of such men might lead to their attaining the position of priests or chiefs. Already we find them wizards, and doubtless ere long they would be credited with more extensive powers. It is impossible here, however, to pursue this subject further³. At all events let us note that the savage who goes to a man of the emu totem when he requires emu, finds an *analogy* in Aelian's statement (*NA.* XI, 9, cp. *RS.*, p. 160, n. 1) that in the sacred island of Icarus in the Persian Gulf the wild-goats and gazelles could not be *successfully* and *safely* hunted until permission had been obtained from the resident goddess (Artemis). It is true that the gap between the two seems wide, but some recently published evidence seems to suggest the manner in which it could be bridged. The *Churinga*, which plays an important part in the *Intichiuma* ceremonies, finds its fellow in the *Madubu* (bull-roarer) of New Guinea, one of the functions of which is to secure good crops, whilst the *Madub*, a wooden image, a kind of "garden charm," would "turn devil" at night-time and go round the

Religion, pp. 257-69 [London, 1901]), but could it be said that this was its original meaning and aim?

¹ *Head-hunters*, p. 134.

² R. H. Mathews, *Queensland Geog. Journ.*, XVI. p. 81 (1900-1).

³ Makrīzī, in his account of Ḥadhramaut (ed. Noskowjy, pp. 24 sqq.; Bonn, 1866), mentions a tribe called 'Omar ibn 'Isā, all the men of which possessed the power of curing snake-bite, also a bedouin tribe, the Ḳamar, in the mountains of Zafār (Dofār), any member of which was supposed to be able to control the rain. Whether these tribes were pure Arabian or not, it is at all events plausible to suggest that they once belonged to snake and rain totems respectively. For an interesting rain-charm practised by the Ḳamar, see Frazer, *Golden Bough*, 2nd ed., I, p. 84.

gardens swinging the bull-roarer to make the yams grow¹. Finally, mention is made of a wooden image, sometimes called Orooadubu (usually translated "god"), which makes everything grow, and before which presents of food are placed when the planting season commences²—thus reminding us of the meal indulged in by the participants of the *Intichiuma* (see above, p. 436). The gradual deification is interesting.

We can scarcely expect to find evidence for the existence of such a totem-system among the Semites. In Australia itself we find a very considerable diversity of usages, and Prof. A. C. Haddon has warned us of the possibility of a "differential evolution" in the history of totemism. "There may be a lagging behind or an acceleration or an entire omission of certain customs and beliefs in even allied tribes which belong to the same general level of culture³." This is more to the point than the view of the late Marillier that totemism is a rare form of cult incapable both of evolution and of transformation⁴, a view which would imply that survivals of animal-worship, ancestor-worship, and the like, are to be regarded as of other than totemic origin. We may only expect to find totemism flourishing where culture is rudimentary, and where the domestication of animals has made no, or at least little, progress. Thus it is that in North America and Australia totemism has lasted until the advent of European man. But how striking are the divergences! The Arunta eat the totem as a solemn rite, among the tribes of North West Canada—to take a recently investigated case—this nowhere happens. The former believe that they are descended from the totem-species, among the latter this belief does not prevail. In both, however, there is the vague bond uniting man and beast, that concomitant of totemism which, it has been conjectured, ultimately leads to the domestication of those animals that have "the instinct of domestication⁵."

¹ Haddon, *op. cit.*, pp. 104, 107. ² *Loc. cit.* ³ *Folk-Lore*, XII (1901), p. 232.

⁴ *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, XXXVI, pp. 368 sq.

⁵ Jevons, *History of Religion*, ch. X; *Folk-Lore*, X, pp. 374 sq.; S. Reinach,

In view of the above differences it may be premature to seek analogies, developments, or survivals of totemism among the Semites before the forms and phenomena of savage belief have been more strictly classified¹. As this has yet to be accomplished it may be useful to present in a condensed and paraphrased form the provisional "code of totemism" which M. Reinach has drawn up, solely as regards the relation between man and animal²:—Totem-animals are venerated and are often believed to be of the same descent with the totem-group; they are usually neither killed nor eaten, but sometimes the prohibition extends only to a part of the animal. If its death is required, apologies are made, or means taken to mollify or remove the penalty of its "murder." After it has been ritually sacrificed, it is mourned; if its dead body is found, it is bewailed and reverently buried. The totem-animal helps and protects the totem-group, it acts as a guide, an augury and fortune-teller. If of a wild or dangerous kind, it spares the members of the group. Finally, where men (1) clothe themselves in the skin of an animal, particularly on the occasion of religious ceremonies, or (2) call themselves by its name, or (3) figure it upon their ensigns, property, or bodies, the animal is a totem provided other evidences for totemism exist. Parallels from the Semitic field will readily occur to every one, though it would be unwise to lay undue stress upon them before we know more precisely what the totem-theory involves. Totemism, in the accepted use of the term, is only a form of animism, and "it is extremely probable," as Prof. Haddon has well said, that "it is only one of several cults of animals"³.

In conclusion, passing over the question of the survivals

Revue Scientifique, Oct. 13, 1900, p. 450. On the other hand, as Mr. Frazer points out (in a private communication), in point of fact neither the North American Indians nor the Australians have domesticated any animal with the exception of the dog.

¹ Cp. Tylor, *Journ. Anthropol. Soc.*, XXVIII (1898), p. 148.

² *Revue Scientifique*, loc. cit.

³ *Head-hunters*, p. 393.

of totemism in the social organization of a folk—perhaps the most complicated of all inquiries—let us remind ourselves of that widespread belief in the transference of a man's spirit or soul into some external receptacle, which, Mr. Frazer suggests, is the essence of totemism¹. In the case of the Arunta tribes the man transfers his soul to the totem² for his own and the common good (viz. the multiplying of food); elsewhere it is rather due to man's desire to put his mortal part out of the reach of harm. It conveys the general idea of an asylum, and is on a level with the belief in the transmission of souls. It takes its rise in that stage of animism where man fails to find any real difference between himself and the rest of nature, animate and inanimate, and finds its expression in the legends and folk-lore stories of metamorphosis and metempsychosis.

Although Semitic examples of the belief of the external soul in its crude form appear to be exceedingly rare³, the conception that a man's life can be wrapped up in some external object on the safety of which his immunity depends, is one that readily lends itself to development and refinement. Thus David's soul is bound up with (i. e. in the care and custody of) Yahwè (1 Sam. xxv. 29)⁴, and, according to 2 Sam. xxi. 17, the life of the nation is wrapped

¹ *Fortnightly Review*, 1899, pp. 844 sq.; *Golden Bough*, 2nd ed., III, p. 418; and for Semitic and Egyptian examples, see ib., pp. 351 sqq.

² This is actually effected by claspings or embracing the *Nurtunja* on the occasion of a painful initiation ceremony. Some of the ancestors are traditionally said to have hung their *Churinga* (soul) on the *Nurtunja* (totem) before going out hunting.

³ Frazer, *Golden Bough*, 2nd ed., III, p. 178; Kremer, *Studien*, I, p. 58. To this we may perhaps add the following from the *Kitāb al-Aṣnām*, quoted by Landberg, *Arabica*, V, pp. 143 sq. (Leiden, 1898). It would appear that every house in Mecca had an idol, and it was the custom of a man to pass his hand over the idol and over himself (the *tamassuh*), the last thing before a journey, and the first on his return. The suggestion is that the man transfers his soul to the idol for the sake of security during his absence from home. Cp. Wellhausen, *Heid.*, 2nd ed., p. 109.

⁴ For the translation of נַפְשׁ cp. Isa. xlix. 4, and Driver's note (*Sam.*, p. 156).

up in David, since the extinction of the "lamp of Israel" seems to entail that of the people. Similarly, the loss of the ark (practically identified with Yahwè) is almost regarded as involving the destruction of Israel¹. To put one's trust in any one may have originally meant to put one's life in the safe-keeping of another. "If ye take not hold (of God), ye shall not keep hold (of life)," says the prophet (Isa. vii. 9), and the thought is paralleled by the words of the Chronicler, where the "taking hold" of Yahwè and his prophets is rewarded by preservation and prosperity (2 Chron. xx. 20)². Primarily, the idea of taking hold, of actual contact, may be part of the grosser conception of the transmission of the soul. Thus, when the worshipper embraces the sacred stone at the Ka'aba, he not only comes into immediate contact with the god, but would seem to place his soul under its protection, and we appear to have an analogous idea of transmission in 1 Kings xvii. 21, 2 Kings iv. 34, where the man of God by throwing himself upon the dead child restores it to life. Finally, the common Hebrew word for "to trust" (*bāṭah*) seems to have meant primarily "to throw one's self upon some one," and *tikwah*, "confidence," &c., if connected with *kaw*, "line, cord," suggests the idea of binding. May we therefore infer that the ideas of confidence, trust, and the like, arose from the fact that a man had placed his life or soul in safe-keeping elsewhere³? This is not to be taken as an assertion that these modes of thought are actual survivals of totemism in Israel, though, if the above evidence from the Old Testament has been correctly interpreted, it would

¹ It is unfortunate that the continuation of the particular narrative to which 1 Sam. iv belongs is wanting.

² Cp. Cheyne, *EBi.*, col. 1495.

³ We may perhaps compare the words of the thorn-bush, "put your trust in my shadow" (Judges ix. 15, *הסר בצלי*). The shadow is often practically identified with the object itself (a good Arabian example is cited by Frazer, *Golden Bough*, 2nd ed., I, p. 287), and the loss of the shadow is regarded as the loss of life itself, cp. Num. xiv. 9 (for parallels see Frazer, loc. cit.).

seem to represent a development of a belief which on good authority is considered to be the essence of totemism.

It has not been my intention to attempt either to prove or to disprove Robertson Smith's theory of Semitic totemism. It is now almost unanimously agreed that he proved beyond doubt that the Semites had passed through phases no less degraded than those of other savage nations, and every one will agree with Dr. Frazer that "whether the Semites had or had not the particular institution of savagery which we call totemism, is a comparatively unimportant matter." It remains for the anthropologists to determine the laws and canons of totemism, and for the Semitists to continue collecting and classifying the phenomena of Semitic heathenism. It should be the aim of the latter, especially, to follow the evidence whither it may lead them, and not to seek to adapt it to, or to interpret it after, preconceived ideas or prejudices. To approach the subject without an acquaintance with and a certain sympathy for primitive modes of thought would be futile: the spirit of the inquiry is aptly and concisely set forth in the words of Littré: "*Il faut que le cœur devienne ancien parmi les anciennes choses, et la plénitude de l'histoire ne se dévoile qu'à celui qui descend, ainsi disposé, dans le passé. Mais il faut que l'esprit demeure moderne, et n'oublie jamais qu'il n'y a pour lui d'autre foi que la foi scientifique.*"

STANLEY A. COOK.